

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

The title is amended to be more descriptive, as requested by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 3-4, 5-7 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Nagumo et al. (US Patent 6,603,496). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed and claim 1 is amended.

Amended claim 1 recites substantially the same features as originally filed claim 3. Additional limitations have been added to claim 1. Specifically, the claim has been amended to require that the output from the "selective-information data feeder," is limited to "screen angles of a plurality of screens".

Nagumo et al. (US Patent 6,603,496, hereinafter "Nagumo '496"), does not specifically teach or even suggest the use of "screen angles." Thus, amended claim 1 should now patentably distinguish from this reference. As used herein, the phrase "screen angles" refers to the angles of screens that are used for special image processing, which is well known to those working in the art to which this invention pertains.

Claims 2 and 6 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Nagumo '496 in view of Nagumo (US Patent 6,028,472, hereinafter Nagumo '472). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed and claim 2 is amended.

Amended claim 2 recites substantially the same features as original claim 4, which depends from originally filed claim 1. Additional limitations have been added to claim 2. Specifically, the "information data" feature has been modified. The claim now requires the use of data relating to "toner charging characteristics of toners of different colors".

Nagumo '496 neither specifically teaches nor even suggests the use of such "toner charging characteristics." Nagumo '496 simply teaches that toner dots are adjusted not only in black-and-white printers but also in color printers.

Amended claim 3 depends from amended claim 1 (now incorporating subject matter from claim 2) and additionally recites the feature "drive current correction data memory".

As amended, claims 1 and 3 patentably define over the combined teachings of Nagumo '496 and Nagumo '472. The added claim limitation relating to "screen angles," required by these claims is not suggested by either of these references.

Amended claim 4 depends from and further limits claim 2. It therefore includes the features of claim 1 and it additionally recites the "drive current correction data memory." Nagumo '496 teaches nothing about the claim 2 feature directed to "toner charging

characteristics." Thus, claim 4 should also now be acceptable in view of these two prior art documents.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Nagumo et al. (US Patent 6,603,496) in view of Inamura et al. (US Patent 6,297,872). Claims 5-11 have been cancelled.

Claims 10-16 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Nagumo et al. (US Patent 6,603,496) in view of Yamada et al. (US Patent 5,565,995). Claims 5-11 have been cancelled.

Original claim 12 was rejected over Nagumo '496 and Yamada et al. (US 5,565,955, hereinafter Yamada '955). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 12 is also amended to add additional limitations. Namely, claim 12 now requires "paper image data representing a degree of density unevenness of the image." The references do not teach or suggest the use of "paper image data representing a degree of density unevenness of the image." Yamada '955 simply teaches monitoring "dot density", and the "dot density" there differs from the "density unevenness of the image" recited in amended claim 12.

Claim 14 has been amended to add further limitations as well. Specifically, claim 14 now requires "toner image data representing a degree of density unevenness of the toner image." Original claim 14 is rejected over Nagumo '496 Yamada '955, but these references teach nothing about such "toner image data representing a degree of density unevenness of the toner image." Yamada '955 simply teaches monitoring "dot density", and the "dot density" there differs from the "density unevenness of the toner image" recited in amended claim 14.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Nagumo et al. (US Patent 6,603,496) in view of Yamada et al, and further in view of Nagumo '472. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 17 depends from and further limits claim 12 believed to be allowable as discussed above. The combination of features required by the claim is not taught even by the combined teachings of Nagumo et al ('496), Yamada et al. and Nagumo ('472).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the application. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 02-4300 under our charge order 032739.092. Any overpayment can be credited to Deposit Account No. 02-4300.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP



Glenn J. Perry, Reg. No. 28,458
1850 M Street, NW – Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone : (202) 263-4300
Facsimile : (202) 263-4329

Date : December 8, 2005

SGRDC\243762.1